

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-18, 21-23 and 30-34 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-18, 21-23 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shrader et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,026,440, hereinafter referred to as "Shrader."

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW:

Applicants conducted an interview with the Examiner on March 16, 2007. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his assistance and for granting the interview. In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments during the interview. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example in Figs. 1(a-c), Figs. 2(a-b), Figs. 6 and 7 and the accompanying description in the Application Specification at page 12, line 27 to page 18, line 29 and page 25, line 36 to page 29, line 6. More specifically, support for the claimed "detecting a password input error at the client-side information processing apparatus," as recited in claim 1, can be found in the specification at, for example, page 6, lines 19-25.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

Shrader allegedly anticipates independent claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 16, and 21.

Shrader discusses, at column 4, lines 61-67:

When the client 10 (through the browser 16) requests a DFS document (step a), the Web server 18 invokes a server path check (using the SAF plug-in 29)(step b). The PathCheck checks with the session manager 31 to determine whether the user has appropriate DCE credentials. If not (step c), the SAF plug-in 29 will return an error message (e.g., "401; Unauthorized") to the browser 16 (step d) and prompt the user for user id and password.

Shrader further discusses, at column 5, lines 16-29:

Preferably, the account manager 25 is implemented as a callable module or plug-in (through the API) of the Web server. ... At step 60, a method of managing Web server transactions

begins by having the server administrator identify a set of one or more resources that are desired to be monitored by the account manager

In other words, Shrader discusses a server-side system that controls user accessibility to the server-based DFS (Distributed File System) document through an account manager in a web server. Therefore Shrader fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, “a ~~processor, processing part configured to detect~~ **detecting a password input error at the client-side information processing apparatus**, and to register **registering information identifying the client-side information processing apparatus** by making a transmission to ain a first database of a-the registration center when the password input error is detected, and to store storing transmission log information related to the ~~transmission to registration in the~~ registration center into said storage unit of said client-side information processing apparatus,” as recited in claim 1, because Shrader discusses a server-based account manager configured to detect unauthorized access to a server-based document in a DFS.

Further, a prima facie case of anticipation can not be based on Shrader because Shrader fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every feature of the claimed embodiment, for example, as recited in claim 6:

a first database ~~configured to register~~ **registering** information identifying ~~a-the first client-side apparatus when notified of a password input error at the first client-side apparatus, in response to a transmission from~~ **by the first client-side apparatus**;

a second database ~~configured to register~~ **registering** the information identifying the first client-side apparatus when the information identifying the first client-side apparatus is requested by ~~a-the second client-side apparatus and the information identifying the first client-side apparatus is registered in said first database, in response to a transmission from the second client-side apparatus~~;

~~a processing part configured~~ **processor** to control registration of information to and deletion of information from said first database and said second database.

New independent claim 35 is a system claim similar in scope to independent claims 1 and 6, and thus independent claims 8, 13, 16, 21 and 35 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for similar reasons as for independent claims 1 and 6.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependence from the independent claims. For example, dependent claim 2 recites, in part, “wherein said ~~processing part includes means for transmitting~~ **processor**... **locks the client-side information processing apparatus** if the information

identifying the client-side information processing apparatus is registered in the first database or the second database." The Office Action, at page 3, line 9, asserts that Shrader anticipates claim 2 because Shrader discusses "disabling a DCE user account." As discussed above, Shrader discusses an account manager for a web server, therefore Shrader only discusses inhibiting a users access to a server by disabling a DCE user account. Therefore Shrader fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "... processor... **locks the client-side information processing apparatus** if the information identifying the client-side information processing apparatus is registered in the first database or the second database" because Shrader only discusses inhibiting access to a web server and thus fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, locking "the client-side information processing."

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims, and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 19, 2007

By: 
Matthew H. Polson
Registration No. 58,841

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501